## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

FILED

	2008 MAY 14 PM 2: 53
TO: MILE DIST	RICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE  CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
FROM: R. Mullin,	Deputy Clerk  RECEIVED DATE: 2 5/7/2008
CASE NO.: 08cv0	325 L (POR) DOCUMENT FILED BY:  Petitioner DEPUTY
CASE TITLE: Burt	ton v. Director
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Request of the Composition of Record for Appeal	
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:	
✓ Local Rule	Discrepancy
5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<b>5.4</b>	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
7.1	Missing table of contents
15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
	Supplemental documents require court order
	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X	OTHER: Case closed.
	Date forwarded: _5/7/2008
TISHEREBY ORDE	ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE
festille coasingueses again	
The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received. The Case ho included	
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? DYes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1	
_	CHAMBERS OF: U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
Dated: 5-13-08 cc: All Parties  By: Kaw Clerk	